APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/543,310	04/05/2000	Rabindranath Dutta	AUS990913US1	6408

45502 ' 7590 06/12/2007
DILLON & YUDELL LLP
8911 N. CAPITAL OF TEXAS HWY.,
SUITE 2110
AUSTIN, TX 78759

EXAMINER
MIRZA, ADNAN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
06/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 March 2007*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *25-48* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *25-48* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 25-31,33-39,41-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Jamtgaard et al (U.S. 6,430,624), Rennard et al (U.S. 6,615,131) and further in view of Warrier

et al (U.S. 6,707,809).

As per claims 25,33,41 Jamtgaard disclosed a method for delivering data over a network system,

comprising the steps of: receiving, in a first data processing system, a request for a first data page

from a first client system; in response to the request from the second data processing system,

sending a reduced-content page, corresponding to the first data page, from the first data

processing system to the second data processing system (col. 2, lines 40-59); wherein said

reduced-content page contains less than the full content of the first data page (col. 4, lines 10-

20);

However Jamtgaard failed to disclose wherein the second data processing system communicates with the data processing system over a first connection and the third data processing system communicates with the first data processing system over a second connection.

In the same field of endeavor Rennard disclosed wireless device communicates through a wireless carrier, gateway and the Internet with server. In one embodiment, one or more of these connections need not be sustained continuously. FIG 9 depicts a method for reducing the time when a connection between the wireless carrier and the server is sustained through the Internet. Among other reasons, this approach proves beneficial in reducing the connection time through the Internet Such a method also proves beneficial when there exists a lag or latency in the Internet connection or where the Internet connection has a high associated cost measured in money, time or other cost factor (col. 17, lines 51-63). The method illustrated in Fig. 9 can be used to remove the connection from wireless device to wireless carrier (col. 18, lines 13-16).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the sending the first data page to a second client system, wherein the first client system communicates with the data processing system over a more expensive connection than the second client system communicates with the data processing system. The method illustrated in Fig. 9 can be used to remove the connection from wireless device to wireless carrier as taught by Rennard in the method of Jamtgaard to reduce the cost of the wireless connection to Internet and reduce latency in terms of down link. .

However Jamtgaard-Rennard failed to disclose and in response to the request from the second data processing system, sending the first data page from the first data processing system but separate and distinct from the second data processing system.

However Jamtgaard-Rennard failed to disclose, "selectively sending a selection mark is received, sending the first data page from the first data processing system to a third data processing system having a common user association with the second data processing system".

In the same field of endeavor Warrier disclosed, "When the home agent receives the data from the source (e.g., WAP oush server), it checks in its mobility binding record to see if the mobile node is currently registered and active. When it determines that the mobile is inactive, the home agent sends a received data indication message to the home agent control node. Upon receipt of a received data indication message, the home agent control node responsively refers to the mobility binding record for idle mobile nodes to identify the foreign agent with which Idle mobile node last initiated a connection. The home agent control node sends a paging request message to the identified foreign agent to cause it to page the mobile node. When the mobile node responds to the page, it reestablishes a connection with said foreign agent and after registration, may receive the data from the home agent using known mobile IP tunneling techniques" (col. 4, lines 28-43).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated When the home agent receives the data from the source (e.g.,

WAP oush server), it checks in its mobility binding record to see if the mobile node is currently

registered and active. When it determines that the mobile is inactive, the home agent sends a

received data indication message to the home agent control node. Upon receipt of a received data

indication message, the home agent control node responsively refers to the mobility binding

record for idle mobile nodes to identify the foreign agent with which Idle mobile node last

initiated a connection. The home agent control node sends a paging request message to the

identified foreign agent to cause it to page the mobile node. When the mobile node responds to

the page, it reestablishes a connection with said foreign agent and after registration, may receive

the data from the home agent using known mobile IP tunneling techniques as taught by Warrier

in the method and system of Jamtgaard-Rennard to reduce the cost of the wireless connection to

Internet and reduce latency in terms of down link.

3.   As per claims 26-27,34-35,42-43 Jamtgaard-Rennard-Warrier disclosed after the

receiving step, the step of creating a reduced-content page corresponding to the first data page

(Jamtgaard, col. 8, lines 12-24).

4.   As per claims 28,36,44 J Jamtgaard-Rennard-Warrier disclosed wherein the first

connection is a wireless connection and the second connection is a non-wireless connection

(Jamtgaard, col. 4, lines 58-67).

5.   As per claims 29,37,45 Jamtgaard-Rennard-Warrier disclosed wherein the first data page

comprises a markup language file (Jamtgaard, col. 6, lines 59-63).

6.   As per claims 30,38,46 J Jamtgaard-Rennard-Warrier disclosed wherein the reduced-

content page comprises a markup language file containing less than the full content of the first

data page markup language file (Jamtgaard, col. 4, lines 59-66).

7.   As per claims 31,39,47 Jamtgaard-Rennard-Warrier disclosed wherein the first data page

is sent to the third data processing system via an electronic mail message (Rennard, col. 9, lines

52-57).

8.   Claims 32,40,48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jamtgaard

et al (U.S. 6,430,624), Rennard et al(U.S. 6,615,131), Warrier et al (U.S. 6,707,809) and further

in view of Puri et al (U.S. 6,148,330).

As per claims 32,40,48 Jamtgaard-Rennard-Warrier failed to disclose wherein the first data page

is sent to the third data processing system via a push delivery system. In the sane field of

endeavor Puri disclosed window has displayed content that was automatically generated and

push-delivered to personal computer by a channel service/content provider via the Internet and

WWW according to the present invention (col. 10, lines 56-64).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to have incorporated the wherein the first data page is sent to the second client system via a

push delivery system as taught by Puri in the method of Jamtgaard-Rennard-Warrier to make the

convential web-browsing technology more efficient.

Response to Arguments

9.   Applicant's arguments filed 03/23/2007 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive. Response to applicant's arguments is as follows.

A.   Applicant argued that prior art did not appear to address a need to send a full version and

a reduced content version of a requested page in response to the same data request.

As to applicant's argument Jamtgaard disclosed, "the system permits content in a variety of

different formats, such as HTML, XML, raw data, etc. to be input into the system and then

permits the content to be output in a variety of variety of different formats such as HTML, XML,

HDML, XML, etc. so that the same incoming content may be displayed so many different

information appliances and devices having different screen sizes (col. 4, lines 10-18).

B.   Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose sending a selection mark to the requestor

and using receipt of a request containing the selection mark as a condition for whether to send

the first data page in addition to the reduced content page.

As to applicants argument Warrier disclosed, "When the home agent receives the data from the

source (e.g., WAP oush server), it checks in its mobility binding record to see if the mobile node

is currently registered and active. When it determines that the mobile is inactive, the home agent

sends a received data indication message to the home agent control node. Upon receipt of a

received data indication message, the home agent control node responsively refers to the

mobility binding record for idle mobile nodes to identify the foreign agent with which Idle

mobile node last initiated a connection".

Conclusion

10.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

11.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner

should be directed to Adnan Mirza whose telephone number is (571)-272-3885.

12.   The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday during normal business hours. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)-272-3933. The fax for this group is (703)-746-7239. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

13.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for un published applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866)-217-9197 (toll-free).

Adnan Mirza

Examiner

JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER